

EXHIBIT 2

From: Arthur Balder <arthurbalderfiles@gmail.com>
Date: Feb 28, 2019, 4:19 AM +0100
To: Bryan Gibbs [REDACTED]
Cc: MP Production Office
<meatpacking productions@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Follow up phone conversation Arthur-Bryan

Ms. Sarandon:

This time you've gone too far.

Our society is tired out of 'celebrities' in a privileged position who humiliate capriciously the work, good faith and professionalism of others without whose enormous dedication they are nothing.

You may have an Oscar, but regretfully you lack many other basic things. You are not only ungrateful, but also unfair. Your communication is full of wrong statements that are in outrageous conflict with the emails exchanged

during the last almost three years, and overacting is the worst performance an actor can offer.

You ought to be a paradigm of good practices, but the reality is far down deep below the acceptable.

We are devastated, astonished, disappointed, but we also feel stronger than ever in our commitment to cinematic art and to fair practices in a film industry that still fosters abusive behaviours.

And now let's go by parts into your disgraceful note:

"I find your email to be extremely rude."

Overacted. Extremely rude is your office making phone calls from no-Id-callers (to avoid leaving a proof of the call taking place), which is a practice generally connected with certain types of 'businesses' whose name I do prefer not to remember; thus calling this way someone you 'office' knows is by definition more than an absence of etiquette. I've had your office phone number for more than a year and never used it until last week, when I left a message for Bryan, which is an evidence of how respectful I and my team are regarding others' privacy. My email is a clear, consequential exposition of the situation. But the truth is uncomfortable.

"I've never received an email like that before from anyone, especially someone whose film I briefly appeared in without compensation."

I've never in my life dealt with someone whose unfairness is so deep and unrelenting as yours, especially when all details regarding this film were exposed to you not only in person the day of shooting, but also before that shooting and also afterwards. The conversations regarding compensations are registered and there are emails about our intentions and your answers—see next below. My first choice had been always Juliette Binoche for that part of the film, but Tigran insisted you lived in New York. You were never my first choice, and I always had my doubts.

"I had no idea you were going to sell this film based on me "

Overacted: the film is sold with what it contains, and you came to the shooting knowing *we were making a film whose topic was Tigran's art in connection with artistic beauty. Logically, you are part of it. You had idea: emails show you were informed we were going to try to sell this film: however, this film is not 'based on you', but in Tigran's life and persona, and there is proof of that:* our intentions and the emails expressing it date long back, and there were answers from your office to these emails, as one on which you accepted a percentage proposed on any benefits generated, among other things, which shows our transparency and good will.

"and if Tigran's portrait was in some way obligating me to do press, I'll gladly give it back."

Overacted: If requesting a public welcoming word from you for the Parajanov-Vartanov Award which you won only in connection with our film and our work of four years, is 'obligating to do press', then we are living in two completely different worlds, the real one, and Ms Sarandon's one. What you were asked for is education, respect, fairness and 'fair professional standards', being respectful for the work of my crew and mine and the producer's, and being also, why not?, thankful to people of the Parajanov-Vartanov Institute. That's not 'doing press', *that's being consequent and fair with the facts: you willingly participated on a film, and you got an award thanks to that participation.* (Period.) **That's not 'doing press', that's showing minimum respect to others people achievements.** 'Doing press' you know it very well is something far different than thanking for a very prestigious award.

"I understand your wanting to get the most press you possibly can"

Overacted: I did not need any publicity to generate in the first three months in the festival circuit more awards than all the documentaries that you have produced together in all your life (including from an Academy-award winner presided jury). **I don't need publicity from you, and never asked for it precisely when it was most logically needed, at the beginning.** I requested respect, not publicity, for our work AFTER the obvious success

achieved.

"but I have nothing positive to say about your film"

Whatever you may think about my film is absolutely irrelevant to me, especially after, again, having won more awards in three months that all the documentaries that you have produced in your entire life. You do politics with your documentaries, capitalizing on your public profile, while on the contrary I do ART. Obviously I know a lot more of how to make an extraordinary documentary film than you. The level on which I work on artistic terms is just something impossible to follow for you, and it doesn't matter if you understand it or not. In short: I read Wordsworth, you read Twitter.

Withal, anybody knows that to make a great film is needed much more than 'a star'. Just watch VIPER CLUB to see what I want to say. The striking similarity of the 'nurse-character' in both my script 16 HOURS and VIPER CLUB is of no importance, honestly, because no one can rescue a bad screen-writing as it is VIPER CLUB just adding a good character background in the last minute. Not to speak about the cinematography or the position of the camera in respect to the frame consequential development. Additionally, 60K total domestic gross out of 70 theatres **is more than it deserves.** I won't go on to enumerate your last ten years of films bombing in theatres.

"and am no longer interested in being associated with it"

Overacted.

It is recalcitrant but necessary to enumerate: you knew what cameras were going to be used, even what lens - the best zoom lens in the world at that time-, before you came to the shooting. Pretending 'not wanting to be associated' with a film where you willingly participated, see and approve of the rough and final cuts before going to festivals and after going to them (successfully), &c. is just overacting, unimpressive, underwhelming.

It is WE who have been treated more than rudely, undeservedly, unfoundedly, and here is most possibly the

truth WHY:

What for you came to the shooting, then, if you did not expect from us to make a film and consequently to try, in all fairness as everybody else –you included with your own films–, to recover one day at least part of the investment, but most importantly to make a unique, good film, as the awards show?

What was the REAL reason why you felt so disappointed so as to do all you could to distance yourself from the shooting and the project...?

You often pretend to be brave; are you brave enough to recognize the true reason I am referring to?

Or much more accurately:

What did you expect from an at that time 39-years-old painter (you were perhaps 70 already), if not just being portrayed, as he faithfully did as best he could?

What else was expected on your side that did not 'happen'?

Is it all this tit-for-tat a response to not getting something else, besides being portrayed, that you expected to get – at least at the time when you came to the shooting?

What was it?

"Please don't contact this office in the future unless it's to give me the address to return the portrait which again, I am happy to do."

Please make sure you or your office do not send calls again from no-ID-callers in the future – ever, – neither contact me nor my office – ever, unless it is to present respectfully an apology and to redress the situation.

We are the victims in all this story, **because the facts do not correspond in fairness with the consequences we have had to endure, and only represent mounting disadvantage perfectly calculated on your side for reasons that are not clear, and that bode ominously ill, pointing clearly in a direction that is extremely rejectable in our society in a moment when everybody has decided to put an end on such behaviours.**

We are now analyzing all this situation, media or no media, and its many implications.

A.

On Mon, Feb 25, 2019 at 6:20 PM Bryan Gibbs

[REDACTED] wrote:

From Susan:

Arthur,

I find your email to be extremely rude. I've never received an email like that before from anyone, especially someone whose film I briefly appeared in without compensation. I had no idea you were going to sell this film based on me and if Tigran's portrait was in some way obligating me to do press, I'll gladly give it back. I understand your wanting to get the most press you possibly can but I have nothing positive to say about your film and am no longer interested in being associated with it. Please don't contact this office in the future unless it's to give me the address to return the portrait which again, I am happy to do.

Susan

BRYAN GIBBS | Office of Susan Sarandon

On Feb 25, 2019, 1:04 PM -0500, Bryan Gibbs

[REDACTED], wrote:

Hi Arthur,

Susan has been traveling for the last week but will back this afternoon. I'll be sure to show her your email below as well.

Thank you,

BRYAN GIBBS | Office of Susan Sarandon

On Feb 25, 2019, 12:11 PM -0500, Arthur Balder

<arthurbalderfiles@gmail.com>, wrote:

Hi Bryan,

the email containing the proposals is very

concise and focuses on the main issues.

Saying yes or no to the jury proposal of Fabrique Du Cinema cannot be delayed, because they have to announce a jury for 2019 and they cannot let it be 'indefinitely'. It's a very logical thing to do. We won Best International Documentary in 2018, and for me it is the same if Ms Sarandon is part of the jury or not in 2019, we're just being nice to both parts by passing the proposal, but they deserve an answer so that they can move on and pick another jury president for 2019.

But **the main question here is Ms Sarandon and 'AMERICAN MIRROR - INTIMATIONS OF IMMORTALITY'**. The proposal of our previous email is very clear, and very 'within' fair professional standards. Fair, because after telling her what cameras were going to be used previously to shooting, then coming herself to the shooting, showing her the final cut several times, after finding an agreement regarding prospective benefits (if any), and after she choosing whatever measurement she thought was good for her regarding the mixed media prepared for her by Tigran, and delivered to her, I can aver that we have been all through this time 'very nice, patient people'.

I did not suggest, nor requested for, any public commitment from Ms Sarandon when it was most needed: at the beginning, before first screening or announcing it.

And I think it was something expectable on my and my team's side, but I did not request it, neither did she do anything spontaneously to help us.

And the beginning, despite that fact, has been quite successful.

Now after the first row of film festivals and quite a few awards, there are some questions that remain open. First, the fact that Ms Sarandon seems absolutely alienated from the film on the public (as on the private) sphere obviously is curtailing our possibilities of success looking forward.

We have devoted 3 years of work to get this film done, and now I can say that, according to some juries (two-time Academy award winner Paul Haggis presided over the Fabrique Du Cinema Award that my film won),

the film is not so bad, isn't?

The question is: What have we done, then, to deserve this estrangement from a great star whom we've treated as good as she has allowed us to do all these three years?

She has gotten the Parajanov-Vartanov Prize thanks to my film being there (we got Best Innovative Film, Best Cinematography and Best Composer, additionally),

and thanks to these three years of work of my team. **She cannot welcome this film publicly along with the award?**

The award is a good excuse to welcome the film, though not a *necessary* excuse to welcome it, and this is what I might call 'fair professional standards' among filmmakers and

actors. After winning in Italy, a journalist as you well know since this info was in our office memo of past week, wrote at magazine Fabrique Du Cinema: "Sarandon looks at her most charismatic ever".

This happens *because* during the previous month to the shooting I calculated where the light should come from, and what was the best make up artist to give a natural 'afterglow' to her presence.

Filmmaking, successful filmmaking, is a collaborative work, and I am missing a 'fair' collaboration, and at this point, in my opinion and anybody's opinion who is familiar with matter, media or no media, this seems to be very well-deserved on my/our side.

TIME now is a factor. This is the moment when we 'must needs' redress the situation, if you want to call it so, or just find out what is going on. Because it is not 'normal'.

All this forcefully-driven-through-the-situation estrangement, underserved and unfounded, for there is no reason that can justify it, even when there is an important award that played into her hands, thanks to

my film's first screening at DOC LA, a film fest curated by the Parajanov-Vartanov Institute in LA, all this is directly affecting our possibilities, and how mayor players in the film festival circuit and distribution industry perceive the film, and, in a few precise words: **this situation fosters a disadvantage to all our efforts.**

That's why I suggested a clear, face-to-face sincere conversation to find out how we, in all our good will, could lastly redress the situation.

But telling me that there is no answer to our fair proposal is not enough at this point. She has immediate access to her emails as everybody else in the world. That's why the first scene-breakdown of my script 16 HOURS got an email answer from you in less than 24 hours after being sent at the end of January 2018.

On the other hand a very important note: I do not answer, do not like, non-ID-callers, which is a practice that is neither within my professional standards, especially coming from long-time known collaborators -as you are one, the emails show it. I DO NOT harass people on the phone once I get their phone number, I DO NOT call unexpectedly if I have it, and suggesting I would by hiding up numbers is wrong. Calling me from non-ID-caller unidentified numbers, coming from your office or your personal desk, as you did last week, is something that is extremely insensitive and tactless after these three years.

Arthur

On Mon, Feb 25, 2019 at 10:07 AM Bryan Gibbs [REDACTED] wrote:

Hey Arthur,

I don't have any news for you at the

moment, so there's no need to meet. I'll get back to you when I hear anything from Susan. I was able to talk to her briefly about the script and she wanted to thank you for sending but said it didn't end up resonating with her.

Thank you and all the best,

BRYAN GIBBS | Office of Susan Sarandon

On Feb 24, 2019, 11:53 AM -0500, Arthur Balder <arthurbalderfiles@gmail.com>, wrote:

Hi Bryan,
let's catch up next week and talk in person about this situation. As almost everybody I generally do not answer "no ID callers" on the phone, you know how much spam there is out there, so sent me an email or notice before trying to contact me this way to be aware that's you.

Arthur

On Wed, Feb 20, 2019 at 13:45, MP Production Office <meatpackingproductions@gmail.com> wrote:

Sorry forgot to add Arthur in CC!

----- Forwarded message -----

-

From: **MP Production Office**
<meatpackingproductions@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Feb 20, 2019 at 1:13 PM

Subject: Follow up phone conversation Arthur-Bryan
To: Bryan Gibbs

Hello Bryan,

let me set down the two most pressing things:

ONE. If Ms Sarandon agrees, she could publish a note on Twitter and

Instagram, with the photo (attached) of the Parajanov-Vartanov award, welcoming it and welcoming the selected release of AMERICAN MIRROR in selected theatres by September 2019 in the USA.

This would be extremely important for all of us, since that would be a sort of public legitimatization of the film, and give some chances at some important film festivals submissions still open, specially **Edimbrug Film Festival** (the most important in the UK, we are in good talks with them), and Sydney Film Festival (Australia), and Moscow Film Festival.

The Parajanov-Vartanov Award has been given and kindly accepted by very important cinema personalities, among them Martin Scorsese, and Francis Ford Coppola has spoken, although not received, about its importance and that of Parajanov's work at THR.

JUST A SUGGESTION FOR THE TWEET/ INSTAGRAM WITH THE ATTACHED PHOTO OF THE AWARD:

"I very gladly welcome the Parajanov-Vartanov Award won for me by AMERICAN MIRROR - INTIMATIONS OF IMMORTALITY, an extraordinary documentary film that will be on selected theatres in the USA in October."

It would be also good to be tagged on the tweet:

@MeatpackingProd
and @parajanov (the Institute tweeter account)

TWO. Fabrique Du Cinema Awards, organized by Fabrique Du Cinema magazine, la 'rivista dil nuovo cinema italiano', offers to Ms Sarandon to be the Jury Award President for 2019. She doesn't

have to be present at the award ceremony, to happen in December 2019, only watch the final selection of films during November to select the winners. **Paul Haggis** was the jury president in 2018, and **William Dafoe** in 2017.

FURTHER INFO RELATED TO THIS POINT:

Journalist Chiara Carna, published on [Fabrique Du Cinema film magazine](#), Italy, about AMERICAN MIRROR and about Ms Sarandon appearance in it:

“Arthur Balder is an artist at the same time creative and meticulous. Indicative of it are the stylistic rigor and the aesthetic care with which he directed ‘American Mirror’.”

Chiara Carnà, Fabrique Du Cinema, Italy

“Susan Sarandon is at her most charismatic in ‘American Mirror’.”

Chiara Carnà, Fabrique Du Cinema, Italy

Link to online edition:

<http://www.fabriqueducinema.com/magazine/documentario/tigran-e-larte-della-bellezza/>

If she accepts to be Jury President 2019 they would need just confirmation, and that's all until final review of selected movies in November 2019. Meanwhile they will announce the jury in March 2019.

Official Site of Fabrique Du
Cinema Awards:

<https://www.fabriqueawards.com/>

THREE. This is not pressing at all, but whenever she would be available, we would love to invite her to our offices on 5th Avenue with 47th Street ([576 5th Avenue #1200, NY](#)), **and introduce to her the Parajanov-Vartanov Award with the due ceremony that she and the award deserve,** and also to have a meeting with the producer, David Shara, who is also a color diamonds dealer, and who would love to introduce to her his fancy color diamonds collections. We think this could be a nice moment to meet in person with our team.

With best wishes, and thank you for your call!

Bella Jazmin

DA VINCI FILMS
[576 5th Avenue #1200](#)
[New York NY 10036](#)
P: 646.726.6264 x23
davincifilms@pm.me
meatpacking.productions@gmail.com
www.dvfm.com

--

DA VINCI FILMS
[576 5th Avenue #1200](#)
[New York NY 10036](#)
P: 646.726.6264 x23
davincifilms@pm.me



[meatpacking productions@gmail](mailto:meatpacking productions@gmail.com)
[.com](http://www.dvfmp.com)
www.dvfmp.com